R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 287 VT 003 821

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF MDTA E AND D PROJECTS CONDUCTED BY MORGAN STATE COLLEGE.

BY- STEVENSON, DIANTHA
BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.,WASH.,D.C.

REPORT NUMBER BSSR-369 PUB DATE MAY 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.68 65P.

DESCRIPTORS- PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, PROGRAM EVALUATION, *ON THE JOB TRAINING, *ADULT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, RECRUITMENT, COUNSELING PROGRAMS, JOB PLACEMENT, TESTING, *PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, *EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, *ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, RURAL POPULATION, FOLLOWUP STUDIES, UNEMPLOYED, NEGROES, COLLEGE PROGRAMS, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, MDTA PROGRAMS, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, MORGAN STATE COLLEGE,

TWO PROJECTS CARRIED OUT IN THE 9-COUNTY EASTERN SHORE AREA OF MARYLAND SERVED ESSENTIALLY THE SAME TARGET POPULATION, THE UNDEREMPLOYED AND THE UNDERPRIVILEGED, IN AN EFFORT TO IMPROVE THEIR OCCUPATIONAL POSITIONS. THE FIRST, SEPTEMBER 1963 TO SEPTEMBER 1964, WAS DEVOTED TO VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND GUIDANCE, AND THE SECOND, JUNE 1964 TO SEPTEMBER 1965, TO DEVELOPING ON-THE-JOB TRAINING OPENINGS AND EASING JOB ENTRY REQUIREMENTS, AND DEVELOPING AND UTILIZING A PREVOCATIONAL HOME STUDY PROGRAM, A NETWORK OF VOLUNTEER TUTORS, COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARDS, AND COUNSELING AND FOLLOWUP TECHNIQUES. FOLLOWUP DATA WERE COLLECTED FROM INTERVIEWS WITH PROJECT STAFF, COMMUNITY LEADERS, AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS 6 TO 12 MONTHS AFTER COMPLETING TRAINING. JUDGED BY THE NUMBERS WHO WENT THROUGH THE SYSTEM, THE FIRST PROJECT WAS NOT VERY SUCCESSFUL AS A TESTING-COUNSELING-TUTORING SYSTEM FOR THE CHANNELING OF UNEMPLOYED INTO VOCATIONAL TRAINING TO IMPROVE THEIR JOB OPPORTUNITIES. ALTHOUGH MORE WAS ATTEMPTED IN THE SECOND PROJECT AND MORE INDIVIDUALS ACTUALLY WENT INTO TRAINING, THE LONG-TERM RESULTS WERE DISAPPOINTING IN RELATION TO PROJECT GOALS. FOR EXAMPLE, INSTEAD OF TRAINEES BECOMING REGULAR EMPLOYEES AT THEIR TRAINING SITE, AS HAD BEEN PLANNED, ONLY 30 PERCENT WERE STILL WORKING FOR THEIR TRAINING EMPLOYER IN JUNE 1966. HOWEVER, 77 PERCENT OF THE FIRST AND 80 PERCENT OF THE SECOND GROUP WERE EMPLOYED COMPARED WITH 42 AND 47 PERCENT AT THE TIME OF RECRUITMENT, AND A GREATER NUMBER HAD HIGHER INCOME LEVELS. AN URBAN-BASED COLLEGE LACKING RESOURCES, BACKING, AND EXPERIENCE IN OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING IS NOT LIKELY TO BE A MAJOR INSTRUMENT IN THE SOLUTION TO THE EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS OF THE DISADVANTAGED, RURAL POOR. (ET)

Special Manpower Volume"

BSSR

ED015287

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF MDTA E & D PROJECTS CONDUCTED BY MORGAN STATE COLLEGE

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

VT003621

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF MDTA E & D PROJECTS CONDUCTED BY MORGAN STATE COLLEGE

Submitted to:

Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
U. S. Department of Labor
(Contract 83-08-03)

Diantha Stevenson

May, 1967

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

BSSR:369

FOREWORD

This report is one of a series of reports on each of eight experimental and demonstration training projects followed up by the Bureau of Social Science Research under Contract Number 83-08-03 with the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training (now the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research) of the U. S. Department of Labor. The eight training projects were conducted by seven institutions scattered from Michigan to Florida. Six of the institutions were considered to be "predominately Negro" colleges: Bluefield State College (West Virginia), Florida A & M University, Morgan State College (Maryland), A & T College of North Carolina, Tennessee A & I State University, Tuskegee Institute (Alabama). The seventh institution was the Job Training Center in Lansing sponsored by the Michigan Catholic Conference. An over-all report will pool the experiences of the several projects and consider their implications for future manpower development programs.

The follow-up studies had three general objectives:

1. to document that the target populations--individuals with especially difficult employment problems--were serviced, that they are trainable and that these institutions can train them;

2. to document whether the training may have affected the employment situation of the trainees: that "trainability" leads to "employability"; and,

3. to identify components of the training projects and community characteristics which may have contributed to the training and employment outcomes.

The "ideal" research design called for "before-after" studies. The timing of the award of the follow-up contract by OMAT to BSSR precluded the execution in its pure form of this design. The contract was awarded after one project had terminated, four others had begun, and the remaining three were about to begin. In all reports the "before" data are based on retrospective observations.

The study plan called for the integration of three distinct bodies of data into detailed reports on the individual projects. The starting point for the analysis was a series of discussions with members of the project staff at each of the training centers. These discussions yielded detailed information about the actual conduct of each project, its goals and methods. From these meetings and discussions it was possible to assemble pertinent histories for each project. Because of the method employed, the central perspective of each history was that of the persons charged with the conduct of the individual projects; the administrators, the instructors and counselors, and officials of the public agencies who may have cooperated in the conduct of the projects. In addition, records which helped to clarify the goals and conduct of the projects were made available to BSSR by OMAT.

This administrative perspective was broadened by a second body of data concerning special conditions in each of the areas where training was given. Discussions about local factors that would affect the outcome of the training projects were held with civic and business leaders in each area by members of BSSR's Study Team. From these discussions information was obtained concerning employment conditions in each area, hiring practices and preferences, skill requirements, etc. Thus, we knew

a great deal about these projects and their setting, but the information we had was from the perspectives of the project personnel and people in what might be called the "power structure" of the local community.

To round out the picture of the projects, it was deemed necessary to view them from the perspective of the people they were designed to serve. This information was obtained through personal interviews by specially trained interviewers. The sampling plan called for interviewing all trainees and a sample of persons who applied for but who did not begin training. Interviewing took place from six to twelve months after the completion of training. The respondents were asked about their personal and economic situations at the time they applied for training in addition to their experiences with the training project and their current situation.

In most interviewing areas no experienced interviewers were available; pools of potential interviewers were formed through the recruitment efforts of BSSR field directors. Negro school teachers were the primary source in most areas. In all, more than one hundred and fifty interviewing recruits passed "screening," passed training, and conducted one or more interviews.

Interviewers underwent intensive training by BSSR field directors to locate the respondents whose addresses, although verified by the Post Office, were up to two years old--and to conduct the lengthy follow-up interview. Where respondents were concentrated, interviewers could be supervised locally; where respondents were scattered, interviewers were supervised by mail and phone from BSSR in Washington, D. C. In either case, all interviews were subjected to quality control procedures designed to yield a high level of completeness and consistency among responses. As a result item response rates are extremely high for all "critical" items in the schedules.

Approximately 2400 persons who applied for training at any of the projects were to be interviewed; completed interviews were obtained from about 1700, a response rate of over 70 per cent. About three fourths of those who began training at any project were interviewed; the rate ranged among the projects from 53 per cent to 96 per cent. Response rates for those who applied for but who did not begin training were somewhat lower. The latter group, it should be noted, could provide a basis for evaluating the recruitment and selection procedures of the projects and, under special circumstances, could serve also as a control group with respect to the effectiveness of training.

The authorship of each individual report was assigned to a permanent staff member of BSSR who also was responsible for the analysis of the several bodies of information available about a project, but each report is also based upon the research contributions of many staff members of BSSR. The studies were under the over-all coordination of Dr. Robert T. Bower, Director, BSSR, with the assistance of Laure M. Sharp, Senior Research Associate. Leslie J. Silverman, Research Associate, was the Study Director, and, together with Mrs. Bettye K. Eidson and Miss N. March Hoffman, Research Analysts, designed the studies of the institutional training projects. Mrs. Eidson designed the study of the on-the-job training project at Morgan State College. The BSSR Study Team consisted of Dr. Frank Cotton, Mississippi State University; Dr. Lewis Jones, Fisk University; and Dr. Charles Grosser, New York University. Field operations for the trainee follow up on the Eastern Shore of Maryland were directed by Barton Sensenig III and Miss Diantha Stevenson during May and June of 1966. Dr. Samuel Lyerly designed the statistical procedures used in the

various reports, and Richard Jones provided data processing consultation. Frank Davis supervised the coding operations and Miss Megan McLaughlin supervised the interviewers and the quality control operation. Donald Goldstein was the programmer. Miss Diantha Stevenson and Miss Angeles Buenaventura also provided valuable assistance.

We are grateful to many individuals throughout the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor who assisted us. Within OMPER, Mr. Robert Lafaso, our first project officer, and Mr. L. B. Wallerstein, who succeeded him, provided valuable guidance and met our requests in a most satisfactory manner.

We are grateful also to the directors and staffs of the training projects who cheerfully underwent so many hours of interviewing by BSSR staff. The helpfulness of employers of trainees, officials of state and local Employment Security Commission offices, and State Education Agencies is acknowledged and appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWARD		iii
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Eastern Shore	1
	Morgan State College	5
II.	THE FIRST PROJECT	8
	Origins of the Project	8
	The Contract	10
	Project Staff	13
	Recruitment and Testing	13
	Counseling and Training	16
	Termination of the Project	20
	Summary of Results	22
III.	THE SECOND PROJECT	25
	Origins and Provisions of the Contract	25
	Project Staff	27
	Interagency Coordination	29
	Job Development	31
	Recruitment	36
	Training	43
	Training Outcome	47
	Summary of Results	50
IV.	THE TWO PROJECTS--A COMPARISON	52

I. INTRODUCTION

This report deals with two projects carried out in the Eastern Shore of Maryland by Morgan State College, Baltimore. The two projects ran sequentially and aimed at the same client population; our report on them also treats them in sequence after a few general comments on the geographic area in which they operated and the institution that carried them out.

The Eastern Shore[1]

The Eastern Shore consists of the nine Maryland counties lying east of the Chesapeake Bay and the Susquehanna River, occupying 3,383 square miles or about one-third of the state. Mostly a flat coastal plain with rich alluvial deposits, it is well watered with a network of creeks, rivers and inlets. In the past the Chesapeake has served as a geographic barrier to easy contact with Maryland's Western Shore with the capital of the state, Annapolis, and with the state's largest city, Baltimore.

Almost immediately after the establishment of the colony in the middle of the seventeenth century, tobacco became the staple crop and the plantation the functional economic unit. The Eastern Shore's economy has been based on its natural resources, both land and sea, from its colonial beginnings into modern times.

The slavery which came into being on the Eastern Shore as a consequence of the plantation system was relatively mild and was not characterized by many of the crudities as existed elsewhere in the country. Nevertheless, it did exist and the social attitudes that it gave rise to still persist today with little modification.

---

[1]The following discussion is summarized from that presented in Part I of the Morgan State College's Final Report on the First Project.

Although the state freed its slaves shortly before the end of the Civil War there were few dramatic economic upheavals on the Eastern Shore. The majority of the plantations merely changed from slave labor to wage labor. Those Negroes seeking to have farms of their own were forced to take the less desirable locations in the back woods and back waters since the less well-to-do whites had already taken the more desirable locations, the "necks." Although the growth of Negro land owners was slow and steady, the large majority of Negroes remained landless agricultural workers, domestics, lumberjacks, and helpers for watermen; many of the more ambitious Negroes migrated to other parts of the country. In time, though, a small professional class of Negroes did emerge. The pattern of race relations was still rigid. Segregation was not only lawful but customary.

The evolution of the present day economy of the Eastern Shore has been influenced by the slow development of an adequate system of transportation. In the past the Eastern Shore has been accessible primarily by means of ferries, individually-owned boats, and some roads. Few of even the larger rivers had bridges. It was not until shortly before 1860 that the Pennsylvania railroad reached Cambridge, and a few years later reached Salisbury. Although it was always possible to reach the Eastern Shore by way of spurs of railroads and highways coming from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, there was relatively little intercourse with the outside world. Contact was limited mainly to those from outside who had business or other interests on the Shore. Thus, the highway system of the Eastern Shore had been developed primarily for local use. The building of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge in 1952 and the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel in 1965 have to some extent alleviated the problem of access to the Eastern Shore. However, there is relatively little public transportation existing on the Shore today.

Although the Eastern Shore accounts for only about one-third of the total land area of the state, it produces nearly half of its farm produce. Chief crops are grain, beans, tomatoes, potatoes, watermelon, dairy products and chickens. The dollar value of the state's seafood products, taken from the Bay, is relatively small, but the Shore accounts for about half of it. The activities of the seafood industry in the state and on the Shore have decreased markedly during this century.

The Eastern Shore is composed of rural counties; there are only two cities, Salisbury and Cambridge, and they are small cities at that. Each county, however, has its own modest urban center. With good roads, automobiles, radios, televisions, metropolitan daily papers and modern household conveniences, it is possible for the moderately affluent to live on the Eastern Shore in much the same way as in a medium-size metropolitan area. Yet the mood and pace of the Eastern Shore is that of rural America rather than urban America.

In 1960 the population of the Eastern Shore was 243,575, 8 per cent of the state's total. Only a fifth of the population of the Eastern Shore lives in towns or cities. Seventy five per cent of the Eastern Shore's inhabitants are white, almost all of whom are native-born. In-migration is slight, while out-migration, especially of younger persons, is great. The ratio of Negroes to whites is slightly higher in the urban areas of the Shore than in the rural areas.

In 1960 the labor force of the Eastern Shore totaled 95,592 or about 55 per cent of the adult population, compared with a rate of about 57 per cent of the state and the nation. The labor force of the Eastern Shore generally can be characterized as having low levels of education, skill and mobility. Unemployment in 1960 was a significantly high 7.4 per cent. The rate for whites, 5.1 per cent, was very close to that for the

nation. But the rate for Negroes was 14.6 per cent, nearly three time the rate for Eastern Shore whites.

The total unemployment in Dorchester County decreased from 13.8 per cent in 1960 to 9.7 per cent at the end of 1962. The closing of one of the largest employers in the Cambridge area in 1963 reversed the trend there, and the rate rose to over 11.5 per cent. The white unemployment rate rose to 7.5 per cent, while the Negro unemployment was 30 per cent. Dorchester County had been declared a depressed area in 1962.

TABLE 1

EASTERN SHORE: PER CENT OF TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE UNEMPLOYED, 1960

County	Total Population	White Population	Nonwhite Population
Caroline	7.2	4.7	12.7
Cecil	6.9	6.1	12.2
Dorchester	13.8	6.6	29.7
Kent	5.1	2.9	10.3
Queen Anne	7.3	5.8	11.9
Somerset	11.9	10.1	15.2
Talbot	4.2	3.1	7.0
Wicomico	5.4	4.0	9.9
Worcester	6.2	3.5	11.9
Total Eastern Shore	7.4	5.1	14.6

Source: U. S. Census of Population 1960, Maryland General Social and Economic Characteristics, Tables 82, 83, and 87.

The general downswing in the economy of the Eastern Shore coincided with the development of civil rights activity on the Shore in the latter part of 1961. For a period of 13 consecutive weeks during the last part of 1961 and the beginning of 1962 "freedom riders" demonstrated in many towns on the Shore. These demonstrations were usually followed by conferences with city officials, businessmen and other community leaders. The majority of the meetings were fruitful and some of the towns requested talks before expected visits by "freedom riders" perhaps in the hope that the visits could be avoided.

All of the meetings, however, did not prove fruitful. Resistance was particularly strong in the two largest cities on the Shore, Salisbury and Cambridge. Where sharp disagreements occurred, the breaches that developed were not quick in closing. In these areas the demonstrations continued and resistance became organized. Local police as well as the National Guard were called in on some occasions. Rioting kept the city of Cambridge in the headlines for weeks.

With the passage of civil rights legislation in the Maryland State Legislature in 1962 and 1963, the civil rights organizations, particularly those operating on the Eastern Shore, shifted the focus of their attention from lunch counters to jobs, and the issue of public accommodation gave way to that of fair employment.

Morgan State College

Morgan State College, a four-year college with an enrollment of approximately 2500, is located in Baltimore, Maryland. It offers general liberal arts, terminal occupational, and teacher preparation curricula.

Aside from the University of Maryland, it is the only state school offering a full range of courses and it has recently started a graduate program.

As far as the suitability of the selection of the sponsoring institution is concerned, Morgan was apparently a better choice than any on the Eastern Shore itself. It was evidently not considered feasible for the predominantly Negro college on the Eastern Shore (Princess Anne State Teachers College) to sponsor such a project, since both faculty and students were more deeply involved in the civil rights movement than the Morgan College personnel whose involvement was not known on the Shore.

The disadvantages of the project being conducted by Morgan are obvious. There is the problem of distance, making for difficulties in communication: Morgan's campus is 30 or more miles from the beginning of the Eastern Shore, and about 150 from the farthest point. On the other hand, it may have been useful for the sponsoring institution not to be on the Eastern Shore, since presumably there would be fewer old grudges or prejudices held against it. Morgan State College had the advantage of being somewhat removed though still relatively well-known on the Shore through numerous students and graduates (doctors, ministers, etc.) living there.

In both the first and second Morgan State College-sponsored projects, the project offices were located on the college campus, on the ground level of the Memorial Refectory Building, in two rooms shared with another college-sponsored project. Little in the way of assistance was asked for by the project staff or granted by the college in either the first or second project. The college administration did, however, take the responsibility of finding a successor to Dr. Melvin Humphrey, Director of the first and second projects, when he resigned in November of 1964. In both projects

it was apparent that the project staff and organization was largely distinct from the general operation of the college, or of any department of the college, and represented something set apart from the general institutional apparatus.

II. THE FIRST PROJECT

Origins of the Project

The origin of the project is summarized in Morgan State's final report to OMPER. In essence, civil rights representatives from both the Eastern and Western Shores of Maryland met with other interested parties in Baltimore in July, 1963, to review the Cambridge situation. A subcommittee was delegated to discuss methods of improving the economic condition of Negroes on the Shore.

A further elaboration of these events is derived from our interviews with the individuals instrumental in developing the basic scheme for a job training project for the Eastern Shore. Their idea was to attack directly the unemployment and underemployment of Negroes by means of MDTA training. A three person group ". . . talked to Washington [who] said that if we firmed up the specific request in terms of need we could get funded. It was at that point that we brought Humphrey in." It is very probable that no state manpower agency had been involved up to this time. One informant said, ". . .by deliberate design we started with Washington. You have to recall the circumstances in 1963-64, the feeling of mistrust, lack of confidence."

Negotiations of the civil rights representatives with the state manpower agencies began in July and continued until at least the end of August. There is some lack of agreement on the content of the negotiations. One version was provided by the OMAT project officer; other versions, in

general agreement, were provided by the state agencies. The latter reported that an "OMAT style" proposal was presented to them in August for their approval. The Maryland Department of Employment Security complained directly to the OMAT representative as well as through the Governor's office that its functions were being usurped by the Morgan project. A similar complaint was registered at the Governor's office by the Maryland Department of Vocational Education (Voc Ed). The latter complained to the OMAT representative (and to the Governor) that Morgan was to provide the training. The same official reported to the BSSR staff that the original contract provided, in effect, that Morgan would supervise the training and, by implication, the state agency.

Other contentions arose during the negotiation period. Apparently, the Federal Bureau of Employment Security and the Executive Director of the MDES both complained that OMAT had gone out of legitimate channels in committing the MDES to the project. The negotiations appear to have taken place between the OMAT representative and the BES regional director.

In retrospect, it is plausible that verbal agreement was reached among MDES officials, Vocational Education officials, and the OMAT officials at their first meeting. But there was only an implied agreement about the details of the proposed project. The project proposal presented at the second meeting spelled out the college's understanding of these details which were not acceptable to the state agencies. Charges and counter-charges were made about the intentions of the state agencies and the "high-handed" methods of OMAT. The state's congressional delegation was called in to ascertain the state of the proposal.

The outcome, clearly, was that the proposal finally limited the college to provide only supplementary, prevocational services and only at the request of the state agencies.

In the background of the negotiations was the history of MDTA. Prior to the first Morgan State College project, only in Baltimore had MDTA training been offered. The provisions of the Act had allowed for 100 per cent federal financing for a two-year period, with funds to be appropriated thereafter on a 50-50 matching basis. The state agencies, according to an MDES representative, had been informed that no allocations were to be made for training purposes after July, 1963, due to the fact that state officials were deliberating entrance into the arrangements necessary for the continuation of MDTA programs. As it turned out, however, 1963 amendments allowed for an additional two-year program with 100 per cent federal financing. Although MDTA training was federally financed, the individual states had authority for the organization of their manpower programs.

At the time that OMAT and the Morgan representative entered the picture, there were no training facilities on the Eastern Shore and Maryland was in the process of determining the feasibility and desirability of conducting a federal-state training program.

The Contract

The first Morgan State College contract provided for a twelve-month program, from September 10, 1963 to September 13, 1964, involving the selection, counseling, testing, evaluation, training, and placement of a minimum of 150 unemployed adults. Characteristically, the target population was to consist of unskilled unemployed adults who were heads of households with at least three years' experience in the labor force.

The project design called for a control group of trainees consisting of individuals meeting existing requirements for entrance into regular MDTA training and an experimental group of trainees who were not able to meet the formal test requirements for training for specific occupations. The control group was to enter already established training programs for occupations while the experimental group of trainees was to enter a special program designed to develop the capabilities expected of persons entering a particular trade or occupation. This special program was to be developed on the basis of an analysis by behavioral scientists and job training specialists of data gathered from case histories, personal interviews and the results of standardized tests taken by the trainees. The contract does not indicate who would develop the special program; the State Department of Vocational Education might have been implied. The analysis of the data was presumably to be conducted by professionals employed by the college under the OMAT contract. Following a period of employment after training, the project design called for evaluations of the performance of both the control and experimental trainees. Standardized tests, supervisor's ratings on a specially designed scale and personal interviews would be utilized.

Morgan State College was responsible for the nonvocational and noneducational aspects of the project including the employment of a qualified individual who would serve as coordinator-director of the supportive services. Additionally, the project was to assist "as needed" the Maryland Department of Employment Security in the recruitment of the trainees for the project and in providing as much preselection testing, vocational counseling and other services to the prospective trainees as was deemed necessary. Further responsibilities of the project staff included the supervision of individual counseling before, during and after

training, assisting the MDES in job development, cooperating with the appropriate agencies in providing the miscellaneous supportive services needed by the trainees, developing and maintaining complete records on methods used and observations made during the course of their contacts with the trainees which would be made available to interested MDES and Voc Ed personnel, and assisting Voc Ed in securing volunteer workers if requested to do so.

Funds totaling $38,250 were granted to the college to enable it to perform these tasks. The project staff was to consist of a full-time coordinator-director-evaluator-counselor, a part-time consulting psychologist, a part-time test specialist, part-time counselors, and a clerical assistant.

The MDES was responsible for the recruitment and selection of the trainees as well as job development and placement of trainees after completion of training.

Voc Ed was responsible for the selection of training sites, training facilities, conduct of training programs and all other matters pertinent to vocational education.

In sum, the above mentioned agencies and groups were assigned responsibilities based on the total needs of a "project" for the target population. Each of these groups had primary responsibilities to the target population trainees and secondary responsibilities to other groups mentioned in the contract. To the trainees, the college had a variety of primary responsibilities, both direct--providing nonvocational counseling before, during, and after training--and indirect--assessing other needs of the trainees such as childcare and transportation. As far as possible the services of the appropriate agencies were to be utilized to fulfill these needs. Secondary responsibilities of the college included assisting

the MDES in its primary responsibilities of recruitment, selection and job placement, when requested, and assisting Voc Ed in its primary responsibility of providing adequate training courses for those individuals selected for training by providing the information necessary to the development of adequate training courses for particular occupations for those individuals.

Project Staff

The project staff in operation consisted of the Project Director, Dr. Melvin Humphrey, Professor of Economics on leave from Morgan State College, one secretary, one part-time stenographer, one part-time clerk typist, four part-time statisticians, four part-time professional consultants in testing and counseling, four part-time community service consultants, and ten part-time casework counselors.

Recruitment and Testing

Recruitment was started by the local MDES offices following the signing of the contract on September 16, 1963. According to plan, individuals recruited by MDES were given the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) in order to determine eligibility for entrance into MDTA training. Those failing the GATB were then referred to Morgan for participation in the special experimental program. By the end of the first week in October, approximately 150 persons had applied and been preliminarily tested by MDES. At that time, since recruitment and selection of the trainees was not proceeding as quickly as desired, the local MDES offices requested the assistance of the project staff in its recruitment effort.

In their recruitment effort the college staff attempted to develop community-wide networks of individuals who were to spread the word about

the training opportunity. These persons--unpaid volunteers--were to encourage interested individuals to apply for training at their local MDES office. This effort bore some fruit; by the end of November a total of 388 individuals had been given the GATB by local MDES offices. Approximately 1000 persons were eventually tested by MDES during that year.

Both the project staff and the staff of the local MDES offices encountered a problem which was to arise again and again during the recruitment phase of operations: apparent apathy towards training on the part of the target population, as possibly evidenced by failure to report for testing to the local MDES office.

Approximately 500 persons who failed to qualify for training through low MDES test performances were eventually referred to the college staff. (See above, p. 11.)

Concurrent with the recruitment effort the project staff was also involved in developing guidelines for selecting tests to be used in the experimental testing program. This testing program was supposed to help in determining the nature of a special training program for the target population designed to develop their capabilities to the level expected of persons in a particular trade or occupation. Regular procedures were developed whereby individuals failing to qualify for the control training group (those who didn't pass the GATB) would be subjected to the experimental testing program.

Tests used in this program were selected by the professional consultants furnished by the Baltimore Urban League. They included the SRA-Non Verbal Test for the assessment of general aptitudes, the Kuder Preference Record for determining vocational interests, the Personal Audit for revealing personality traits of the trainees, the STEP Reading and Arithmetic Tests for determining levels of academic proficiency, and the

Cornell Index as needed for exploring any neurotic tendencies that might have been indicated by the Personal Audit. The results of this battery of tests were to be used in conjunction with a personal history record in interviewing applicants who were considered trainable.

The first experimental testing session was held in Easton during the second week in December, 1963. Out of a total of 43 individuals in that area who were scheduled to report for testing, only 26 actually reported to a local high school where the tests were given. Additional testing sessions were held in Cambridge and again in Easton in January, 1964. In Easton and Cambridge, the interviewing of the prospective trainees was done by the paid local community service consultants, the part-time casework counselors and four high school seniors working on a part-time basis as casework counselors, all under the direction of the Project Director. The tests were administered by the consultants furnished by the Baltimore Urban League and the project staff. In Salisbury and Snow Hill where the tests were given in February, 1964, they were administered by the casework counselors. Detailed results and evaluations of these tests were presented in the project's Final Report.

In an effort to solve the apparent apathy on the part of the target population, the project staff utilized the services of the local community service workers and local casework counselors. These persons were to contact those individuals who had failed to report for testing, whether to the local MDES office or to Morgan, determine the reasons for that failure, and attempt to encourage them to report at rescheduled sessions, either at Morgan or MDES.

There is little indication that the results of these tests were used in the development of the tutorial program or that much of the information was given to Voc Ed for its use in developing vocational training courses. Test results were given to the MDES for those individuals referred by the project to the MDES for regular MDTA training.

Of the approximately 500 individuals who were referred, a total of 270 were retested by the project staff. Of those not retested some failed to appear at a scheduled testing session and others, due to the project's lack of time at that time, were not scheduled at all. The sample of these 270 retested experimental trainees to be interviewed by BSSR was composed of all those who received tutoring and/or prevocational counseling from the project (91 individuals), plus half of the 179 who had been retested but received no training. The total sample consisted of 179 individuals, of whom 93, or 52 per cent, were actually interviewed by BSSR in May-June 1966; these individuals will be referred to hereafter as "the trainees."

Briefly summarized, all but two of the trainees were Negro; two-thirds were women. Most were between 31 and 35 years of age. The average level of education was about 10 grades of school; 24 per cent had completed less than 9 grades while 34 per cent had completed 12 or more grades. Fifty-eight per cent of the trainees were unemployed at the time of their application for training. Forty-two per cent said that they were the head of their households.

Counseling and Training

During January and February, 1964, the project staff embarked on the third stage of its operations: providing prevocational counseling and upgrading academic instruction--tutoring--for the experimental group.

Following their development, a program of counseling and tutoring was put into operation toward the end of February in Cambridge, the first area to be so serviced. Supervised and administered by Morgan State College, the services were rendered by a combination of community service workers, local casework counselors, and a network of local tutors, all working part-time.

The program provided instruction in basic arithmetic and practical English. Each trainee was to receive three graduated home study instruction books in each subject. The trainee was expected to study the materials 12 to 14 hours per week and meet with a tutor for an hour a week to discuss the materials covered and receive assistance as needed. In some cases, where the trainee had an initially higher level of achievement, the number of books to be covered was reduced.

The tutorial program utilized the services of the International Correspondence Schools (ICS). In both of these areas, the ICS was to provide all testing materials, instructional materials and instruction, while the project staff was to provide adequate study hall facilities in addition to the volunteer tutorial service.

Along with practical instruction in Arithmetic and English, the prevocational plan called for a series of group meetings conducted by public health authorities and home demonstration agents dealing with such topics as personal behavior and adjustments in family dynamics which might be necessary at the time that the trainee went into vocational training. This part of the program appears to have been neglected.

Following completion of the home study program, each trainee was supposed to be referred by the project through MDES to the appropriate vocational training program.

The tutorial.--Of the 270 individuals retested by the project staff, 91, or 34 per cent, were enrolled in the home study-tutorial program. That not all of those so enrolled actually completed the home study work is indicated by the results of our interviews with 93 of the original 270. Of those interviewed, 33 were enrolled in home study tutorials and 17 reported that they believed they had completed the course.

TABLE 2

TUTORIAL PROGRAM; INTERVIEWED TRAINEES

	Number	Per Cent
Completed tutorial	17	18
Did not complete	12	13
Unable to say whether completed	4	4
Not enrolled	60	65
Total	93	100

Vocational training.--Examination of the project records shows that 18 of the original 270 retested individuals were enrolled in regular MDTA vocational training as of February, 1965. An additional 33 individuals were referred to MDES for entrance into vocational training in April and May of 1964 but were not enrolled, making a total of 51 referred by the project. Of the 18 enrolled in training, 11 completed the course. These data are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3

VOCATIONAL TRAINING; EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

	Number	Per Cent
Not referred for training	219	81
Referred but not enrolled	33	12
Enrolled but did not complete	7	3
Completed training	11	4
Total	270	100

Based on this small number of cases we see a completion rate for those enrolled from the project of 61 per cent, which is somewhat lower than the over-all Eastern Shore Voc Ed completion rate of 82 per cent for the occupation categories involved.

There was some overlapping between the tutorial and the vocational training program, as revealed in the interview study and shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

TUTORIAL AND OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING;
INTERVIEWED TRAINEES

	Number	Per Cent
Received tutoring only	25	27
Received training only	8	9
Received both	8	9
Received neither	52	55
Total	93	100

Counseling.--The general counseling responsibility of the project, not precisely defined to begin with, appears to have been honored mainly in the breach. Since counseling could have taken the form of anything from a conversation with a staff employee to systematic help in the solution of a family problem, it was difficult for the interviewees in our study, at least in response to the questions asked them, to define contacts that could be clearly classified as "counseling." In any case, our interview data do not allow for any quantitative statement as to the extent of counseling. Nor are there project records available to allow for such a statement. The informal interviews carried out by BSSR with members of staff, however, strongly suggest that time was not available for anything like a systematic counseling program.

Termination of the Project

Criticism of the project's operation began after two and one-half months of operation, toward the end of November, 1963. Complaints made by members of the project staff and persons associated with the project were voiced in the newspapers of the Eastern Shore and Baltimore. These complaints, though varying in specifics, generally accused state agencies of non-cooperation.

One particular series of complaints accused the MDES of not doing all it could to obtain applicants for the program, as well as accusing the local MDES office in Cambridge of referring the unemployed to jobs without telling them about the program. In regard to the latter, it might well be remembered that finding jobs for unemployed individuals is one of the responsibilities of the MDES; since there was a limited number of training opportunities existing on the Shore at that time, and Cambridge had a 30 per cent unemployment rate, not all of the eligible individuals could possibly have been served.

In regard to the first part of the complaint, it should be noted that with the recruitment of 179 individuals, the goals of the project (a minimum of 150) were met. That most of these were recruited through the efforts of MDES is indicated from data collected in our interviews with a sample of the recruits. They were asked for their first source of information as well as later sources. Forty-eight (52 %) of those interviewed cited the local MDES office as their first and only source of information about the project. An additional 20 (21 %) cited the local office along with another source, while only 25 (27 %) cited sources exclusive of the local MDES office.

TABLE 5

SOURCES OF INFORMATION CONCERNING THE PROJECT AMONG TRAINEES INTERVIEWED

	Dorchester County		Other Counties		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
MDES office only	18	38	30	67	48	52
MDES office and other[a]	14	29	6	13	20	21
Other[a] only	16	33	9	20	25	27
Total	48	100	45	100	93	100

[a]Other includes mass media, friends and relatives, churches, ministers, public schools, public agencies other than MDES, civil rights organizations, etc.

The complaints continued to be voiced during January and February. Seemingly as a result of these complaints, a meeting was held in Baltimore on February 19, 1964, attended by representatives of the MDES, the Bureau of Employment Security, HEW, OMAT, the State Voc Ed Department and Morgan State College.

It was decided at this meeting to change the basic design of the project by eliminating the distinction between the control and experimental groups of trainees. Instead, the program was to be conducted for all potential clients under the regular MDTA training with the necessary academic instruction included. Representatives attending the meeting sought to create an atmosphere of better understanding among the agencies involved in the program. After a discussion of the curriculum, time, facilities, and financing, a number of decisions were made which allocated responsibility for various aspects of the future operation of the project.

1. The Department of Employment Security will have, by February 24, 1964, requests for training facilities in sixteen occupations and will have furnished the MT-1's [forms providing job analysis and certificate of demand] to the appropriate authorities.
2. The Department of Education will have their training plans completed by April 1, 1964, and will do their best to provide training facilities and instructional services as promptly as possible.
3. Doctor Humphrey will have 50 individuals ready to be referred to the training facilities by April 1, 1964. This includes prevocational academic training to the 50th percentile of the 7th grade level.

Training courses to be offered included building maintenance, farm equipment repair, boat repair, service station attendant, sewing machine operation, auto mechanic, clerk typist, cook, nurse aide/orderly, and welding.

With the referral of 33 individuals during late April and early May, in addition to the 18 referred and enrolled as of February of 1964, the experimental project was concluded, pending the approval of a new contract.

Summary of Results

The contract for the first Morgan State College project outlined a variety of primary and secondary responsibilities of the three parties involved in its operation. On the college's part, these responsibilities included assessing and filling such needs of the trainees as childcare and transportation. The college had secondary responsibilities which included assisting MDES in recruitment, selection, and placement of the trainees, and assisting Voc Ed in the provision of adequate training by providing the information necessary to the development of appropriate courses for particular occupations.

There was, therefore, a rather wide range of activities to be carried out by the college. With the small staff assigned to the project, it is

unlikely that all goals could have been achieved; our investigation showed some were not. Among the specific accomplishments of the first project are the following:

the Maryland Department of Employment Security was assisted in recruiting for the first testing program;
available standardized tests were reviewed and a final battery selected for the pretesting of the experimental group;
two hundred and seventy of those assigned to the experimental group were retested;
the project initiated a tutorial program for about a third of the experimental group;
the project finally referred 51 persons to MDES for placement in vocational training programs.

The project achieved very little toward its projected aim of providing counseling and supportive services to the trainees. Some of the part-time caseworkers recruited for these purposes were actually used as test administrators. Furthermore, there is no indication that the project staff attempted to keep in touch with those trainees who entered vocational training either while they were in training or after completion of training and placement in jobs.

The retesting of the trainees done by the project staff was supposed to have determined the nature of the training program for the experimental group of trainees who had failed to qualify for entrance into regular training, and the college staff, according to the plan, would have worked with Voc Ed in determining the nature of the training courses for the experimental trainees. There is no indication that they did so. Furthermore, there is every indication that the purpose of retesting was to a certain extent altered to become, rather, a means of assessing the prospective trainee's ability to learn.

The tutorial program was of doubtful value to the trainees. It is hard to imagine that trainees without sufficient as well as continuous motivation would be able to study the materials for the required 12 to 14

hours a week in addition to holding down a job, as many of the trainees did. It is especially hard to believe that persons would do so with no guarantee of their future entrance into vocational training. Unfortunately, there is no hard quantitative data to support our assessment. We do know, however, that recruitment into the tutorial program was achieved for only about a third of those who were identified as eligible for it, and of these, about half did not complete the program. Furthermore, projecting from our interview data, only a very small number of those who were involved in tutorials had gone on to vocational training at the time of the interview, two years later.

If one conceives of the first Morgan State College experiment as a testing-counseling-tutoring system for the channeling of unemployed into vocational training to improve their job opportunities, it must be said that the experiment was not very successful, based on the numbers who went through the system. On the other hand, it must be mentioned again that the college took on a very large task with a very small budget. Furthermore, the political and social climate in which the project originated and operated was not conducive to uninterrupted professional accomplishment. The project was born out of civil rights agitation, and lived its life in an atmosphere of race tension and of charges and counter-charges by vying institutions. Much of the time and energy of the Project Director (the only full-time professional involved) was spent of necessity in the political arena.

Finally, and on the positive side, it is likely that the project's intervention accelerated by at least several months the provision of regular MDTA training on the Eastern Shore, a view shared by the MDES.

III. THE SECOND PROJECT

Origins and Provisions of the Contract

The impending termination of the first project and delays in setting up vocational training classes on the part of the Department of Vocational Education led to negotiations with OMAT for a new project. These negotiations began in March of 1964, after the first project had been in operation for six months, and continued into May. At this time seasonal work opportunities began to increase. The project staff feared that unless some training was started immediately many of the people recruited for the first project would return to their usual pattern of seasonal work.

The design for a new project began to develop because of the widely held belief in OMAT at the time that On-Job-Training (OJT) might be a solution to one of the major problems of E & D programs, developing jobs for "hard-core" trainees and placing them after completion of training. Melvin Humphrey, Director of the first Morgan project, prepared a proposal for an "Experimental and Demonstration On-Job-Training Project for the Eastern Shore of Maryland," to be conducted by Morgan State College. The development of a simplified procedure by which E & D projects could subcontract for OJT increased the attractiveness of OJT as the mechanism for training.

The second Morgan State College contract provided for project operation from June1, 1964 to September 15, 1965. The college was responsible for the development of OJT opportunities for a minimum of 200 unemployed and educationally deficient persons residing in the nine counties of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The contract anticipated that Morgan would attempt to

rerecruit and place those individuals from the first project who had not received the expected training, who were unemployed, interested in receiving training, and who were eligible for OJT opportunities.

Morgan State College itself was to be responsible for the administration and supervision of all aspects of the project and was to employ a qualified individual to function as the coordinator-director.

Eight explicit demonstration objectives were described in the contract:

1. the development of OJT opportunities (including preapprenticeships) for the afore-mentioned population in the public and private sectors of the economy of the Eastern Shore;
2. urging small employers to adopt training programs and encouraging the adoption of more functional entry job requirements compatible with the population to be served by the project;
3. the utilization of individually tailored OJT projects as a means of training large numbers of geographically scattered rural persons;
4. the development of "job conditioning" and prevocational home study programs which would prepare these persons for entry into job training situations;[2]
5. the development and utilization of a network of volunteer tutors and counselors to provide the "job conditioning" and prevocational home study program;
6. the development of local community advisory board structures to help stimulate OJT in small communities;
7. the utilization of part-time indigenous nonprofessional workers to develop and supervise the OJT; and
8. the designing of counseling and on-going follow-up techniques to be used by the part-time indigenous nonprofessional workers in improving and maintaining trainee morale and efficiency while in training.

As the over-all design was envisioned, there were four explicit steps: first, in-service training for paid project personnel; next, identification of those persons not trained in the first project eligible for OJT; then, prevocational home study followed by OJT job development, all to be accompanied by "on-going continuous" counseling and follow-up service.

---

[2]No funds were allotted for this purpose in the budget.

To assist in developing OJT opportunities, the contract called for the Director to be assisted by a rural community advisory team. The prevocational home study program was to be carried out by a volunteer tutorial team. Finally, to assist in the prevocational home study program, job development, and "on-going continuous" counseling and follow-up, the contract called for a part-time community service team. The staff for the project was to consist of the Director, the chief OJT specialist, both full-time, and the part-time community service workers.[3]

The contract provided $53,500 for all expenses other than the OJT subcontract fund, for which an additional $40,000 was provided. An amendment to the contract in the fall of 1964 added $50,000 to the OJT subcontract fund.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT), although not a party to the OMAT-Morgan State contract, was required to approve all training plans before the subcontracts were signed by the Morgan State College representatives and the participating employers. BAT and OMAT personnel were to train the project in the methods of developing OJT opportunities and the preparation of training plans.

Project Staff

Melvin Humphrey, the Director of the first project, continued as the Director of the OJT project for the first six months. In December of 1964 Charles W. Fletcher, a retired school principal, succeeded him and remained with the project for its duration. During the tenure of both Directors, Earl Redwine Jr. served as the Chief OJT Specialist, with primary responsibility for developing the OJT opportunities.

---

[3]The duties of the personnel were set forth in the attachment to the contract entitled "An Experimental and Demonstration On-Job-Training (OJT) Project for the Eastern Shore of Maryland," on pages 9 and 10.

In addition to the full-time staff members based at Morgan's campus in Baltimore, there was the team of the six indigenous nonprofessional field workers. Three of these field workers, one each in Cambridge, Easton, and Salisbury, functioned as Community Service Coordinators. Their responsibilities included active participation in general project-community relations, contacting and motivating the target population, and recruiting and counseling OJT trainees. Two additional field workers, one each in Elkton and Crisfield, functioned as both Community Service Coordinators and OJT specialists, while the sixth member, based in Easton, functioned as a general OJT specialist.

The planned in-service training of the part-time nonprofessional indigenous field workers was provided in a two and one-half day workshop, held in Baltimore on September 23, 24 and 25, 1964, three months after the contract was signed. At the workshop the goals and objectives of the Morgan OJT project were discussed in relation to specific needs and problems. Representatives from the Maryland State Department of Employment Security (MDES), the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT), and the Baltimore Urban League were present to inform the field workers about the techniques of manpower training, community development programs, methods of reaching and communicating with the target population, recruiting and screening, OJT job development, job orientation, employer relations, providing on-going services, preparation of OJT proposals, evaluation of training and coordination of OJT and community service activities. A second day-long workshop was held for the entire staff in January of 1965 at about midpoint in the project's operations. The new Project Director was introduced to the staff and project goals and progress up to January were discussed and analyzed.

Interagency Coordination

A Labor Department news release announced the beginning of the new project on June 1, 1964: "following approval of the new project today, Secretary Wirtz is sending a team of manpower experts to the Eastern Shore on Tuesday to meet with representatives of Morgan State College regarding further assistance necessary to get the program underway." Assistance was rendered at a meeting held in Baltimore on June 5, 1964, four days after the signing of the contract. The manpower experts involved were from the MDES and the BAT. At that meeting plans were discussed for interagency cooperation in relation to the project's objectives. A number of agreements were made which had a direct impact on the operation of the project.

First, "it was decided that existing local MDTA advisory committees be asked to function in the area," instead of following the project's proposed plan to develop its own local OJT advisory committees.[4]

Second, the BAT representative "explained that the Bureau of Apprentice Training was not engaged in promotional activity except as related to apprentice training." However, BAT field representatives would be available to explain details and regulations of the OJT program to employers. Also, BAT would provide for the project's use a list of companies on the Shore who had experience with apprentice programs. In addition, the BAT representative recommended that a letter explaining the OJT program be sent

---

[4]The 1963 amendments to the MDTA also provided for the establishment of local or regional Manpower Advisory Committees, in addition to the National Manpower Advisory Committee, composed of representatives from labor, management, agriculture, education and training, and the public in general, for the purpose of making expert assistance available to persons formulating and carrying out programs under Title II. On the Eastern Shore, each County Manpower Advisory Board had as its chairman the manager of the local MDES office. The composition of the individual committees was to be reviewed and the membership of each increased, if necessary, to ensure that organized labor, minority groups and employers were adequately represented.

to all employers in each county in the name of the County Manpower Advisory Committee. The manager of the Cambridge MDES office agreed to draft a letter for endorsement. The local MDES offices were to provide the mailing lists, and the Morgan State College project staff would handle the printing and the actual mailing of the letters.[5] The Director of the MDES stated that the MDES was in the process of (1) obtaining a roster of all applicants in the active files in Eastern Shore offices and would make this list available to the project when it was available; (2) contacting employers to develop opportunities for trainees under OJT; and (3) designating a coordinator who would represent the MDES in the project.

Third, it was agreed that the project staff would work closely with the local MDES offices in both job development and recruitment. MDES agreed to assist in the training of the project's OJT specialists in employer visiting, use of employer records kept by MDES, and preparation of the employer visit report. Occupational analysts of the MDES would be made available for assistance "in writing job descriptions to be submitted with training proposals."

In addition, it was agreed that each MDES office would receive copies of an MDES form modified for the project's use, the "Record of Employer Visits," and that "all job orders for trainees under the OJT program will be recorded on MDES Employer Order forms with copies to the MDES local office and to the OJT Specialist." Referral and verification data was to be recorded on both MDES and Morgan copies of the job orders.

---

[5] It was agreed that "leads developed by the MDES and those resulting from the letter to employers" would be followed up by the BAT representative or his staff "pending the recruitment and training of OJT Specialists by Morgan State College."

It remained to the Morgan State College project staff to coordinate the recruitment, selection and referral of all trainees, whether referred by MDES, the employers themselves, or specifically recruited by the project staff.

Job Development

The staff of the OJT project conceived of job development as "going through the public and private sectors of the business community of the Eastern Shore," locating existing and potential job vacancies, and negotiating with the employers for the provision of OJT. In so doing the project utilized a number of lines of communication with the business community.

As planned, each County Manpower Advisory Committee sent out a letter to most of the employers in their individual counties during the first two months of the project's operation, June and July. These letters explained the nature and purposes of the project, and requested any employers interested in providing OJT to contact the local MDES office. The local MDES office would in turn relay the request to the project staff.

Local MDES offices, as agreed, assisted in the development of OJT opportunities by informing those employers (whose requests they could not fill immediately by adequately trained persons in their files) of the existence and nature of the OJT, and suggesting that the employers train the needed employees themselves.

Both the project's Director and the Chief OJT Specialist spoke to many employers' associations, such as the Chamber of Commerce, to service clubs, and to local biracial committees, explaining the purposes of the

project and asking interested employers to contact them. Local newspapers and radio stations also aided in publicizing the purposes and activities of the project.[6]

In developing OJT opportunities the project had three goals. First, the project attempted to deal with the problem of discrimination against the hard-core unemployed regardless of whether it was based on race, education, sex, or any other factor. Second, the project sought to educate participating employers in the use of more relevant criteria in the selection of employees. Third, the project was interested in opening up jobs which were full-time, nonseasonal and adequately paid. These goals, inherently difficult to meet, were rendered even more difficult by the nature of the Eastern Shore's economy.

The economy of the Eastern Shore was and still is one of major seasonal fluctuation, being primarily based on agriculture and seafood (both growing and processing) with little in the way of major manufacturing. One of the manufacturing industries on the Eastern Shore, the garment industry, was precluded from the project's activities by the Secretary of Labor as well as by the unions concerned. Only agriculture and seafood remained as major employment areas. Since both of these, as well as the majority of jobs available in them, were subject to distinct seasonal variations, being relatively stagnant during the winter months, and since the project wanted to develop jobs which were both full time and nonseasonal, these two areas, with the exception of the crab pickers mentioned above, were excluded from the project's job development efforts. What remained was a mixed group of small manufacturing and service employers.

---

[6]Pressure resulting from publicity attendant on the signing of the contract was put on the project to develop a large number of opportunities within a short period of time. The result of this pressure was the signing of two contracts in the middle of June calling for the training of 60 crab pickers.

A further difficulty was introduced by the extremely tense racial situation on the Eastern Shore at the time the project got underway.[7] Although not specifically directed to the Negro unemployed, publicity attendant on the first project and the beginning of the second project led to the assumption that it was primarily for Negroes. Further substance was lent to this assumption by the placement of a nondiscrimination clause in each contract as well as by the presence of a Negro college's name in the letter prepared by the local County Manpower Advisory Committees. The project staff felt that unless they were positive that a business would agree to nondiscrimination in hiring and employment, they should not discuss the possibility of OJT with the employer. It is possible that some employers were deterred from even contacting the project in response to the letter sent out by the Manpower Advisory Committees because of the inclusion of the college's name in the letter, as well as by other things they may have heard about the project.

Despite these limitations, leads were developed to 130 employers thought to be interested in the OJT program. These leads came through a variety of sources, summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6

SOURCES OF LEADS TO EMPLOYERS INTERESTED IN OJT

	Contacted		Signed		OJT Openings	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
MDES Leads	58	45	24	51	97	44
Project Leads	55	42	13	28	54	24
Employer, Chamber of Commerce and Human Relation Committee Leads	17	13	10	21	73	32
Total	130	100	47	100	224	100

[7]This was particularly true in Cambridge where the National Guard was patrolling the streets in June.

Of the 63 contracts signed with 47 employers, the project cancelled 5 and allowed 18 to expire. Two contracts were cancelled on grounds of racial discrimination, and 3 because employers were no longer interested in OJT. Three contracts died because the employers (with perhaps unrealistic expectations as to the qualifications attached to the job) rejected all applicants sent to them. Seven contracts were allowed to expire because business appeared to be slow and the employers felt unable to start training during the specified period of time. These data are summarized in Table 7.

TABLE 7

FATE OF OJT CONTRACTS

	N	%
Fulfilled Contracts	39	61
Cancelled		
Racial discrimination	2	3
Employer no longer interested	3	5
Expired		
Employer rejected all applicants	3	5
Business was slow	10	16
Employer no longer interested	3	5
Other reasons	3	5
Total	63	100

One of the problems cited by the project in regard to job development was that the smaller businesses tended to overreact to slight fluctuations in the local economy. Initially some of these businesses were optimistic as to their need for more employees and signed contracts, but when a minor slump in the local economy occurred their response was that because "business was slow" they would be unable to commence training in the foreseeable future. This experience suggests that OJT programs will not be successful with very small employers in this type of area unless the employers become more realistic with respect to their business situations.

The majority of employers signing contracts were small businessmen, with fewer than 50 employees (the average number of employees per employer was 23). Consequently, there was a preponderance of contracts calling for one or two trainees. The average (mean) number of trainees per employer was 3.

The project signed contracts for OJT in a variety of industrial areas. Of the 47 employers signing with the project, 10 were in manufacturing,[8] 1 in construction, 2 in public utilities, 6 in local commercial enterprises, 14 in transportation, communication and storage, and 12 in services.

The job opportunities developed by the project were at a variety of skill levels. The following table presents a breakdown of the slots developed and the slots filled, according to the Definition of Occupation Title (DOT) skill level code.

TABLE 8

OJT JOBS DEVELOPED BY OCCUPATIONAL TITLE

	Slots Developed		Slots Filled[a]	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Professional and Managerial	10	4	8	5
Clerical and Sales	12	5	10	6
Service	26	12	22	12
Skilled	87	39	74	41
Semi-skilled	29	13	24	13
Unskilled[b]	60	27	41	23
Total	224	100	179[a]	100

[a]Two trainees switched OJT positions; they are counted twice in this table.

[b]These were the crab pickers.

[8]Includes two crab picking contracts with a total of 60 OJT positions.

The project signed contracts with employers in 7 of the 9 counties comprising the Eastern Shore. The largest number (15) of the contracts was in Dorchester County which also had the highest unemployment rate on the Shore.

Recruitment

The project established, on paper, a rather elaborate recruiting and screening process. In practice, the recruitment of individuals for OJT was generally on an ad hoc basis; the phasing of the recruitment effort, on the whole, was determined not so much by the types of jobs developed by the project as by the timing of individual contract negotiations and the types and locations of employers signing contracts. Individuals were recruited for specific jobs either when those jobs became available or when the project staff realized that within a given number of days they would have an opening in a particular place. Given the local conditions and staff limitations under which the project was conducted this procedure had much to recommend it.

The project staff had four sources from which they might recruit potential trainees: (1) the files of the first project, (2) the local MDES office's rolls of unemployed individuals, (3) employers themselves, and (4) lists of persons interested in training prepared by the community service workers. The project assumed that most of the individuals in the first project who had not received the expected training would be interested in being trained in the OJT project. It was found, however, that many of these individuals were either not qualified for OJT opportunities or were no longer interested in training, since in the intervening period of time they had found jobs, even though many of these jobs were seasonal.

The project asserts that the lists of unemployed individuals maintained by the local MDES offices were used sparingly in locating and placing individuals.

As we will see later, they may have underestimated the usefulness of this source, as well as the role of the employers as a recruitment source. It was alleged that both the MDES offices and the employers tended to recruit only those individuals who were highly qualified for the job and who did not necessarily fit the project's standards for eligibility.

The fourth source for recruiting trainees, the lists prepared by the community service workers, was considered a last resort. The lists were small and less comprehensive than the others. They were compiled by the community workers of individuals who were unemployed, interested in receiving training, with a low level of educational achievement. In seeking potential trainees for a particular opening, these lists were combed for individuals who could fit the qualifications for that opening.

Our best information on how useful these various sources of information were in providing OJT recruits comes from our interviews with 90 trainees who were asked how they "found out about" their job. The answers to this question are summarized below.

TABLE 9

SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT JOB

	Number	Per Cent
Project staff	4	5
MDES	18	20
Friends/relatives	11	12
Employer's advertisement	9	10
Employees of employers	20	22
Already working for employer	11	12
Other (CNAC[a] and others)	17	19
Total	90	100

[a]Cambridge Nonviolent Action Committee

As we see in Table 9, direct contact by the project staff accounted for only a small proportion of the recruitment, while the Employment Service accounted for a fifth of it. Directly or indirectly, the employers were the major source, providing 44 per cent of those recruited and placed.

The actual selection of the trainees was made by the employer. He often had, as we see above, his own list of prospects and in addition he had a number of others recommended to him by the project as meeting the requirements of the job. From these sources, he made the final determination.

Thus in the total operation of recruitment and placement procedures it was the employer, in accordance with his needs, who called the turn. The initial recruitment of potential trainees was made from the available sources in anticipation of the signing of a contract or after the contract had been signed. Then the selection of the particular trainee was made by the employer from the information made available to him by the project or from among those he had recruited himself. (See also above, p. 34.)

One casualty of this procedure was the home study phase of the original project design. The project staff discovered at an early stage of its operations that it would not be practical or feasible to include the pre-vocational home study program in the project. Aside from the fact that no funds were allocated for this program in the budget, there was usually an extremely short time between the development of the job, the actual recruitment and the placement of the trainee. This shortness of time did not allow for a "meaningful" job conditioning and prevocational home study program to get underway. The program was to have been developed for each individual trainee, taking into consideration his personal educational deficiencies as well as the instructional materials necessary to his training occupation. As stated in the Final Report, the project staff found it almost impossible to convince employers of the value of home study of materials related to the occupational training program. A large number of the employers would not accept any trainee

who needed remedial educational work in language and arithmetic before being able to perform the necessary tasks involved in the training occupation. As a result of the methods of recruitment and the dropping of the prevocational home study program, the project staff found it unnecessary to develop and utilize the volunteer network of tutors, who, as envisioned in the project design, were to work with the counselors in this program. It remains to be seen whether this type of home study program would have an effect upon an OJT program.

Where time and resources permitted, the project did, however, attempt to provide some prejob counseling on what the employers expected of employees and why. Because of the limitations of the project's time and resources, those who did receive prejob counseling were only given enough to allow for their continuation in the program. The counseling efforts of the project will be dealt with in greater detail in a later section.

The target population of the project's recruitment efforts consisted of those individuals who were inferior in the eyes of the labor market because of race, lack of education, age, or erratic employment histories. The project was supposed to develop OJT openings for a minimum of 200 unemployed and educationally deficient persons, which it did. However, all positions developed were not filled; 225 opportunities were developed, but only 177 individuals were placed.

Table 10 through 12 present some of the characteristics of these on-the-job trainees. They were fairly evenly split between Negroes and whites with a slight majority of the former. Two-thirds of all trainees were male, but among the Negro group taken separately, more than half were female. Thus the trainees tended to be white males and Negro females. Given the project's pragmatic recruitment procedure these were the two groups who could best qualify for the OJT openings, crab pickers and nurse aides for the latter, and the skilled and semiskilled jobs (janitors, sheet metal workers, etc.) for the former. In two other characteristics (age and education) the two groups were quite similar.

TABLE 10

TRAINEES BY RACE AND SEX

Sex	Negro		White		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	16	42	41	79	57	63
Female	22	58	11	21	33	37
Total	38	100	52	100	90	100

TABLE 11

TRAINEES BY RACE AND AGE

Age	Negro		White		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
18-25	12	32	15	29	27	30
26-40	10	26	19	36	29	32
41 and over	16	42	18	35	34	38
Total	38	100	52	100	90	100

TABLE 12

TRAINEES BY RACE AND EDUCATION

Years in School	Negro		White		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-7	9	23	12	24	21	23
8	5	13	9	17	14	16
9-11	15	40	17	32	32	36
12+	9	24	14	27	23	25
Total	38	100	52	100	90	100

Turning to employment history, it is seen in Table 13 that 61 per cent of the trainees were unemployed at some time during the 12 months prior to entrance into training.

TABLE 13

EMPLOYMENT STATUS DURING YEAR PRECEDING TRAINING BY RACE

	Negro		White		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Employed	10	26	25	46	35	39
Unemployed at some time	28	74	27	54	55	61
Total	38	100	52	100	90	100

Forty per cent of the whites were unemployed at the time of entrance into training, as opposed to 71 per cent of the Negroes.

TABLE 14

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF ENTRANCE INTO TRAINING

	Negro		White		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Employed	11	29	31	60	42	47
Unemployed	27	71	21	40	48	53
Total	38	100	52	100	90	100

Looking at the trainees in terms of their primary occupations, it is seen that the whites tend to be in professional, clerical and sales, crafts, operative and kindred worker categories, while the Negroes tend to be engaged in laboring occupations.

TABLE 15

PRIMARY OCCUPATION OF TRAINEES BY RACE

	Negro		White		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Professional, clerical and sales	0	0	12	23	12	13.5
Craftsmen and kindred workers	1	3	11	21	12	13.5
Operatives and kindred workers	8	22	17	33	25	28
Protective and other service workers	2	5	8	15	10	11
Laborers	24	65	1	2	25	28
Farmers, farm managers and laborers	2	5	3	6	5	6
Total	37[a]	100	52	100	89[a]	100

[a]"No Answer" in one case.

Finally, the trainees were recruited for the OJT project from 8 of the 9 counties of the Eastern Shore.

TABLE 16

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE FOR ALL TRAINEES

County	Trainee Total	
	Number	Per Cent
Caroline	28	16
Cecil	51	29
Dorchester	61	34
Queen Anne	1	1
Somerset	9	5
Talbot	11	6
Wicomico	7	4
Worcester	9	5
Total	177	100

In summary, the trainees tended to be white males and Negro women. About a fifth of them had not completed elementary school, but a quarter had completed high school. Nearly half (47%) were employed at the time they entered OJT.

Training

The project design called for a job analysis to be obtained from the MDES by the project staff for each job opportunity developed by the project. The project staff then designed a training program for that opening (or openings) with the assistance of the BAT representative or with the aid of one of the BAT manuals. The training plan was then shown to the employer for his

approval and the employer was allowed to add any skills he felt to be necessary or desirable. When the training plan was approved by the employer it was sent to a BAT representative for approval. Following official BAT approval, the contract with the accompanying training plan was signed by the Director of the project and the employer.

According to the training plans the trainees were supposed to learn a number of specific tasks in a specified period of time, with a certain number of hours per work week devoted to the instruction of the trainees in these tasks.[9] The number of hours varied from contract to contract, though in the majority of contracts 10 hours per work week were supposed to be allocated to instruction. In addition, each employer was to assign one or more persons to the task of instructing the trainees as well as (in larger installations) the supervision of the training.[10] In some instances it was assumed that the trainees would receive a written statement of the tasks they were supposed to learn.

An integral part of the project design was the on-going counseling effort of the project staff. Counseling was not performed at specified times during the training period, but rather was done as needed. It was primarily a means of keeping lines of communication open between the employers and the trainees.

---

[9]Each training proposal contained in addition the allocation of the number of hours required to learn each skill.

[10]In the case of the first two contracts, the crab pickers, full-time instruction was provided for the trainees--that is, the trainees were in training all the time. Additionally, both of the employers provided a full-time training instructor for every six trainees.

The project staff had the right to visit the training sites at any time during the training period, in order to talk with the instructors, the employers, and the trainees, as well as to examine the payroll records to make sure that the trainees were being paid the wages stipulated in the contracts, which ranged from $1.00 to $2.75 per hour. According to the project staff, they were asked not to make formal inspections as such, but rather informal ones. These informal inspections, however, were regularly scheduled. In training programs lasting more than 20 weeks the staff tried to visit the employers every 6 weeks, while in shorter programs they tried to make monthly visits. Some of these informal visits were made by the community service workers.

In the visits, employers, instructors, and trainees were encouraged to report any problems and complaints that had arisen. To elicit honest and frank appraisals, the complaints or problems were discussed with the instructors, employers, and trainees separately. Problems involving the trainees' attitudes, behavior or progress were discussed by the staff personnel at some place other than the employer's premises.

The project staff state that no universally used procedures or techniques were developed by the project staff for dealing with the varied problems which turned up, but rather that solutions and techniques were developed when the need arose for them. Standardization was not sought in this phase because the project staff wanted the flexibility of thought and action necessary to deal with each problem or crisis individually. As a part of the counseling effort, the project staff stated that they were concerned with the building and the maintenance of a high level of trainee morale. They felt that unless the trainees' interest and morale were maintained the instruction would be wasted, and that the trainees' job performance would suffer as well as their chances for successful completion of the training program.

From the BSSR interview data, it appears that slightly less than two-fifths of the trainees may have been actually contacted by project staff members while they were on OJT status or afterward. Sixty-one per cent said that no one from Morgan State nor anyone who said he was helping with the OJT program even talked to them about matters related to their job.

That the contact between the trainees and those responsible for the project was less than might be desired is indicated also by the fact that 13 per cent never found out (up to the time of the BSSR interview) that they had been on OJT. And many more did not know about their status when they started to work. Of the total group:

40 per cent knew from the beginning they were on OJT,

36 per cent thought at the beginning that it was a regular job, and

24 per cent said that at the beginning they were not told one way or the other,

13 per cent of the 90 trainees interviewed never found out they were on OJT.

Taking just those trainees who knew they were in training either in the beginning or subsequently, eliminating the 13 per cent (12 cases) who never found out, we can examine their sources of information about OJT status.

Table 17 confirms again the dominant role of the employers in relation to the trainees. This would hardly be surprising in any ordinary OJT program. It is interesting in this case, however, in view of the Eastern Shore projects' original designation of significant roles for the Morgan staff, MDES and others in recruitment, selection, pretraining, counseling, etc. From the standpoint of most of the trainees, the employer was the sole source of OJT jobs and information about them.

TABLE 17

SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE OF OJT STATUS AMONG TRAINEES WHO KNEW THEY WERE IN TRAINING

Learned From:	Number	Per Cent
Project staff	7	9
Employer or employees	51	66
ES posting or interviews	10	13
CNAC	5	6
Other	5	6
Total	78	100

Training Outcome

The project achieved a completion rate somewhat better than 60 per cent among those trainees who were subsequently interviewed, and who knew they had been in training, as indicated by Table 18. It may be indicative of some vagueness in the program that 16 per cent of the group could not say whether they ever completed the training or not.

TABLE 18

COMPLETION RATE AMONG TRAINEES WHO KNEW THEY WERE IN TRAINING

	Number	Per Cent
Completed training	48	62
Did not complete	17	22
Don't know	13	16
Total	78	100

There was of course the hope that most if not all of the trainees would switch to regular jobs in the OJT training site upon completion of their training. About three-fourths of those aware of their OJT status were indeed offered jobs by their employers, as seen in Table 19. By June of 1966 only 30 per cent were still working for their training employer.

TABLE 19

JOB OFFERS BY EMPLOYER AND OUTCOME AMONG TRAINEES WHO KNEW THEY WERE IN TRAINING

	Number	Per Cent
Offered job, accepted and remained	23	30
Offered job, accepted, did not remain	15	19
Offered job, did not accept	18	23
Not offered job	22	28
Total	78	100

Finally, Table 20 shows a distribution of current occupational identification among all interviewed trainees rather close to the distribution of training occupations. The biggest shifts may be noted between previous and present occupation, especially a sharp increase of those in the "protective and other service workers" category--these being almost all nurse's aides (over half), cooks, janitors--and decrease in the number of laborers.

TABLE 20

PREVIOUS TRAINING AND PRESENT OCCUPATIONS OF TRAINEES

Occupational Classification	Previous Occupation						Training Occupation						Occupation at Time of BSSR Follow-Up					
	White		Negro		Total		White		Negro		Total		White		Negro		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional, clerical and sales	12	23	-	-	12	13	7	14	3	8	10	11	8	16	1	3	9	10
Craftsmen and kindred workers	11	21	1	3	12	13	14	27	4	10	18	20	9	17	2	5	11	13
Operatives and kindred workers	17	33	8	21	25	28	10	19	3	8	13	15	12	23	9	24	21	23
Protective and other service workers	8	15	2	5	10	11	21	40	8	21	29	32	20	38	9	24	29	32
Laborers	1	2	25	66	26	29	-	-	20	53	20	22	3	6	15	39	18	20
Farm managers, farmers and farm laborers	3	6	2	5	5	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	5	2	2
Total	52	100	38	100	90	100	52	100	38	100	90	100	52	100	38	100	90	100

Summary of Results

The second Morgan State College contract set forth eight specific demonstration objectives, among which was the development of OJT openings, a prevocational home study program, a network of volunteer tutors, local community advisory OJT boards, counseling and on-going follow-up techniques, the easing of job entry requirements, and the utilization of part-time nonprofessional indigenous workers.

Morgan State College was the only party to the contract, but in a meeting following the signing of the contract details of the project's operations in cooperation with ES and BAT were decided upon.

The project was responsible for the coordination of recruitment, selection and referral of all trainees, as well as for following up job development leads coming from MDES through its membership in the local County Manpower Advisory Committees. These committees took the place of the OJT advisory boards which the project proposed to develop. Jobs developed through these committees accounted for 44 per cent of the total number of jobs developed, while project-developed jobs accounted for 24 per cent and leads from other sources accounted for 32 per cent of the jobs developed.

The prevocational home study program with its network of volunteer tutors was dropped because of shortness of time between recruitment and placement, as well as lack of interest on the part of the participating employers.

A small number of trainees (4%) were recruited directly through efforts of the project staff, while a larger per cent (19 %) were recruited through local MDES offices, and a still larger per cent (44%) were recruited by the participating employers and their employees. Little in the way of counseling was attempted by the project staff, and very little follow-up was attempted.

Some gains were made in terms of easing job entry requirements, perhaps as much as could be expected in that type of economy. About all that was attempted in the way of on-going contact with the trainees was an informal visit to the employer once a month or every six weeks by either a member of the professional project staff or one of the part-time nonprofessional indigenous workers. The part-time nonprofessionals also assisted in the job development effort.

Although more was attempted in the second project and more individuals actually went into training, the long term results were disappointing in relation to project goals, for when interviewed in June of 1966, only 30 per cent of the trainees were still working for their training employer.

IV. THE TWO PROJECTS--A COMPARISON

The two Morgan projects were designed to serve essentially the same target population--the underemployed and underprivileged. The techniques adopted differed, the first project being devoted to vocational training and guidance and the second to on-the-job training, but the utlimate goal of improved occupational position for the target group was the same for both. It is interesting, therefore, to compare the results of Morgan I and Morgan II as alternative solutions to the same problem.

They may, indeed, be compared as independent projects. Despite the fact that Morgan II was seen partly as a follow-on to the first project and potentially serving the same individuals, the break between them turned out to be almost complete. Only one person was identified in the Morgan II interviews as having been involved in Morgan I. Somehow the two projects selected different individuals from the same population to serve.

As the following table shows (Table 21) the characteristics of the individuals recruited into the two projects were quite different. Morgan I was practically all Negro, while the second project recruited about equally from both races. Whereas Morgan I was mainly female, Morgan II was mainly male; and Morgan II drew mostly heads of households while Morgan I did not. Adding these three factors together, we see that Morgan I tended to recruit female Negro dependents, whereas Morgan II tended to draw male white heads of the house, along with some fewer Negro females. It would seem clear from this that whom one can line up for preoccupational testing and tutoring and whom one can place in OJT constitute quite different groups in the aggregate.

TABLE 21

RACE, SEX, HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD; TWO MORGAN PROJECTS[a]

	Morgan I		Morgan II	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Race:				
White	2	2	83	47
Negro	91	98	94	53
Sex:				
Male	31	33	57	63
Female	62	67	33	37
Head of Household:				
Yes	39	42	55	61
No	54	58	35	39

[a]Based on sample interviewed--totals 93 for Morgan I and 90 for Morgan II--except Morgan II race tabulations based on total trainees: 177 cases.

In a fourth respect also the two groups differed. Table 22 indicates that the first Morgan group was generally better educated than the second; for instance, 74 per cent of Morgan I recruits compared to 61 per cent of Morgan II had at least some high school. This finding is somewhat surprising, since one could expect that the better educated would be more attractive to employers for on-the-job training positions. Apparently, education by itself did not operate as an important recruitment and placement criterion in Morgan II. In fact, according to their own statements, the project staff attempted to minimize educational attainment in their dealings with employers on OJT placement.

TABLE 22

EDUCATION: TWO MORGAN PROJECTS

Grades Completed	Morgan I		Morgan II	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1-7	15	16	21	23
8	9	10	14	16
9-11	38	40	32	36
12+	31	34	23	25
Total	93	100	90	100

In one final respect the two groups also show some dissimilarity. Both contained a majority of persons who were unemployed at the particular time of recruitment, with Morgan II drawing slightly more of the already employed. Morgan I recruits also show a poorer employment record over the year prior to the time of entry into training. We see from Table 24 that over half (47%) of the Morgan I group were unemployed for 15 weeks or more, compared to about a fourth of the Morgan II recruits.

TABLE 23

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT TIME OF APPLICATION

	Morgan I		Morgan II	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Employed	39	42	42	47
Unemployed	54	58	48	53
Total	93	100	90	100

TABLE 24

EMPLOYMENT DURING YEAR PRIOR TO TRAINING

	Morgan I		Morgan II	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Fully employed	25	27	54	60
Unemployed:				
1-14 weeks	18	19	11	12
15-26 weeks	18	19	5	6
27-52 weeks	29	31	16	18
N.A.	3	4	4	4
Total	93	100	90	100

In all respects other than educational level, therefore, the Morgan II project recruited those with better occupational potential in the socioeconomic climate of the Eastern Shore--white, male, heads of household with more stable job histories. It may be attributed to the efforts of Morgan II that they were able to involve as many as they did of the apparently less attractive prospects--Negroes, females, the less-educated.

At the time of the BSSR interviews (two years after the completion of Morgan I and a year, give or take several months, after Morgan II) we find the lot of both groups somewhat improved. Seventy-seven per cent of the Morgan I respondents were employed at the time of the interview (May-June 1966) and 80 per cent of Morgan II. This compares to 42 per cent and 47 per cent at time of recruitment into training.

The past six-month job history shows the following pattern:

TABLE 25

EMPLOYMENT SIX MONTHS PRIOR TO INTERVIEW

	Morgan I		Morgan II	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Employed[a]	46	50	61	68
Unemployed:				
1-14 weeks	19	20	10	11
15-26 weeks	26	28	14	16
N.A.	2	2	5	5
Total	93	100	90	100

[a]Employed defined as not unemployed for more than a week during the six-month period.

This recent employment history shows the Morgan II trainees still faring better than the Morgan I. Unfortunately we do not have comparable before-training data on a six-month basis, so it is difficult to judge relative improvement in job stability for each group. Income figures, however, may be used as an indication of how much, relatively, the lot of each may have improved. In Table 26 the Morgan II figures are extrapolated from a six months' experience to give a yearly income estimate.

TABLE 26

DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED YEARLY INCOME LEVELS

Estimated Yearly Income	Morgan I				Morgan II			
	Before Training		After Training		Before Training		After Training	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-$1999	32	34	27	29	12	13	8	9
$2000-$3999	24	26	26	28	27	30	20	22
$4000+	15	16	23	25	32	36	43	48
N.A.	22	24	17	18	19	21	19	21
Total	93	100	93	100	90	100	90	100

We see here an apparent increased income for both groups. This improvement may actually have been greater than indicated since the posttraining estimates, based on the six months prior to May-June 1966, would not have taken adequately into account the fuller seasonal employment during the warm months.

In our judgment, it is extremely difficult to draw broader generalizable conclusions from these two projects. The economic and political difficulties in the area were paramount, and the institution was ill-equipped for the task, because of its location, its limited staff resources, its lack of previous experience, and the absence of existing communication channels with employers and official agencies in the manpower field. As a result, Morgan I never became an integrated "employment-oriented" project, whereas Morgan II was run by employers rather than the project. Whatever the solution to the employment problems of the disadvantaged, rural poor is to be found, an urban-based college lacking resources, backing, and experience in occupational training is not likely to be a major instrument in this effort.